

tion of a constitutional amendment to eliminate poll taxes, admitted that under section 2, article I, of the Constitution the only restriction upon the right of a sovereign State to fix the qualifications of its voters was that the States shall not impose upon those who vote for Federal officials greater restrictions than are proposed for those who vote for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

As the Senator has pointed out, we have before us the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, in 1959, in the North Carolina case of Lassiter against Northampton Board of Elections, which held that a literacy test in North Carolina, which is in almost the exact language used in the bill, was constitutional; yet the bill provides that it will be illegal.

I invite the attention of my friend from Mississippi to another illegality, another unconstitutional provision in the bill, which we need time to consider and discuss.

Students of constitutional law know that the Supreme Court and State courts have held that Congress shall have no power to fix the qualifications of those who vote in local elections, provided they are not discriminated against because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Virginia has a law which requires a voter to pay his poll tax of \$1.50—all of which goes to support the schools of the State—6 months before the election.

Is it not true that the bill provides that in Virginia a person who paid his poll tax to a Federal examiner 45 days before election would qualify to vote; and that in that way the bill would nullify our local laws on the subject? That is my understanding of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. The States themselves determine the qualifications of their electors.

Mr. ROBERTSON. This bill violates that fundamental principle, does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled, "Hysteria Seen in Voting Rights Bill," written by David Lawrence.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HYSTERIA SEEN IN VOTING RIGHTS BILL
(By David Lawrence)

Emotional hysteria—the unthinking mood that has destroyed many a free governmental system in the history of the world—is about to sweep aside some of the vital provisions of the Constitution of the United States. This document specifically provides that the States shall determine the qualifications of voters and that the Federal Government cannot exercise any powers that have not been delegated to it by the Constitution.

President Johnson and his Attorney General have presented to Congress a bill whereby any "test or device" established by the States to qualify voters can be brushed aside and Federal registrars—appointed by an agency of the executive branch of the Government—would then register any voters they please.

Actually the Constitution, under the 15th amendment, gives Congress only the power to pass laws forbidding any State to deny

the right to vote on the basis of race or color. But it is one thing to stipulate a form of punishment for an injustice proved to have been committed by a State, and it is quite another to deprive the States of their power to say who shall or shall not vote on the basis of any qualification they may desire to set up so long as it doesn't discriminate on account of race or color.

The Supreme Court of the United States, which interprets the Constitution, declared unanimously in the famous Lassiter case in 1959 that the States may, without violating the Constitution, use literacy tests as a prerequisite to eligibility for voting. The exact language of the opinion is as follows:

"We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope for exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot."

The same opinion quoted from a previous ruling of the High Court, in what is known as the Guinn case, as follows:

"No time need be spent on the question of the validity of the literacy test, considered alone, since, as we have seen its establishment was but the exercise by the State of a lawful power vested in it not subject to our supervision, and indeed, its validity is admitted."

There is no authority given Congress by the Constitution to interfere in the way local elections are held or the manner in which voters are declared eligible so long as States do not abridge the right to vote on the basis of race, color, or sex.

Yet the bill submitted by the White House and the Department of Justice would permit the Attorney General to ignore any State laws on voter registration. Nothing more would be required than the filling out of a form for an applicant to be registered and given a certification of "eligibility to vote." This would, moreover, cover all elections—Federal, State, and local.

It is also proposed in the new voting rights bill that the Federal Government intervene if any State wherever 50 percent of its residents of voting age have not been registered in the past. Some Negro leaders have pointed out that this will not take care of situations in districts where there are enough whites registered to fulfill the 50 percent rule without any registration of the Negro population. There is likely, therefore, to be considerable controversy on this point.

The proposed legislation is a conspicuous example of an effort to accomplish a reform under the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." But, in the long run, constitutional government cannot be maintained or preserved if the men who are sworn to uphold it feel that they can change the Constitution at will, without going through the regular process of amendment, which requires not only the affirmative vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress but also ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures.

There are some Members of Congress whose consciences will bother them and who will insist upon at least a thorough debate of the bill's provisions and a discussion of the constitutional issues involved. The American people have not yet been told the whole story, and it looks as if it will take a long time for the facts to reach them.

The truth is that if, by the passage of a single law of Congress, the rights of the States can be taken away from them with the excuse that it is merely desired to prevent some possible abuse of power, then the United States will no longer be governed by a written constitution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. It is true, is it not, that the bill which has been introduced, and which we have been reading about in the newspapers, is not in printed form, and there has been no opportunity to obtain a copy of the printed bill and to study it?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. I hold in my hand a copy of today's Wall Street Journal, which I believe all will agree is a most reliable publication. Although we do not always agree with its conclusions certainly it publishes facts as the facts are. I call the Senator's attention to these words of the Wall Street Journal on March 18, 1965, at page 3:

The heart of the measure, already much discussed, calls for the Federal Government to take over local voting-registration machinery, if necessary, to stop discrimination on the basis of race. This in itself was enough to guarantee that the constitutionality would be challenged.

But the fine print unveiled yesterday contains another constitutionality novel section that is bound to prove equally controversial: A requirement that a State or local government whose voter qualification law is nullified by the new Federal act must obtain prior Federal court approval before trying to enforce any new law. Johnson administration experts and constitutional authorities at universities agree that no previous law has ever required that local governing bodies submit their work for advance Federal approval.

COURT'S STAND IN DOUBT

That section "seems to stand our constitutional system of judicial review on its head, albeit for a worthy end," said Prof. Robert G. Dixon, Jr., of the George Washington University Law School here.

Can the Senator from Mississippi contemplate or imagine any provision more destructive of the rights of a legislature or the sovereignty of a State than that, after a State has enacted a law, before the law can become effective in that State, it must be approved by a Federal judge, who may well have been named by the administration and by the very Attorney General who wrote and seeks this law? Can the Senator think of anything more destructive and far reaching than this proposal?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. It means that voter qualifications in the States will be fixed by the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. HILL. That could well be the result; could it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, it would be the result.

Mr. HILL. This point should be studied by the Judiciary Committee, should it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course. It is necessary to take time to study it and go into these matters.

Mr. HILL. In time it might apply not only to certain States, to which it is intended to be applied, but it might apply also in many of the other 50 States of the Union. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. It will in time, of course.

March 18, 1965

5230

Mr. HILL. As Professor Dixon states, we are standing it on its head, which means destruction.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to preface my questions with a statement. It is unthinkable to the Senator from Mississippi, who has had an opportunity to make only a quick examination of the major provisions of the bill, that Members of the Senate who are versed in the law would hastily send the bill to committee with a limitation or restriction attached to it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. The restriction in the bill is 2 weeks. That is a pitiful thing, if we really mean to study a proposal of this magnitude.

I invite the Senator's attention to the top of page 11 of the bill, to illustrate what I mean. At the top of page 11, in section 11, paragraph (b), there appear these unparalleled words.

No court other than the District Court for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to issue any declaratory judgment or any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction against the execution or enforcement of any provision of this Act or any action of any Federal officer or employee pursuant hereto.

In bold type is printed a provision that throughout the 50 States, from Hawaii to Alaska, from New York to Florida, any order restraining a provision of this act would have to be argued before the District Court for the District of Columbia in Washington, for adjudication and determination.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unheard of.

Mr. STENNIS. It applies also to the Federal officer or the employee pursuant thereto. Is it not unthinkable that a matter like that should be proposed and referred to a committee?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is unthinkable; it would set a precedent that would cause great damage in the future.

Mr. STENNIS. It would open the floodgates. With the pressure of the times and the demands on the President of the United States, where would we stop, or would there be any way to stop it?

Mr. EASTLAND. There could not be.

MR. HAUGERUD'S TRIP TO SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield for an insertion in the RECORD to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, Mr. Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance in the State Department, recently returned from a 10-day inspection tour of South Vietnam. The Federal Times of March 3, 1965, contained an article on Mr. Haugerud's trip and the work of U.S. civilians in South Vietnam entitled "Dedicated Workers Conquer Hazards."

In the belief that the article will assist the Members of this body in their continuing study of our effort in South Vietnam, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEDICATED WORKERS CONQUER HAZARDS

WASHINGTON.—Neither adverse climate, sniper fire, nor sneak attacks by the Communist Vietcong deter the American Federal civilian employee from courageously carrying out his duties in battle-torn South Vietnam.

So says Howard E. Haugerud, Deputy Inspector General of Foreign Assistance in the State Department.

In an interview with Federal Times, Haugerud—who recently returned from a 10-day inspection tour of desolate outposts fringing steamy, bug-infested jungles, barren wastelands and virtually inaccessible, rugged mountain terrain—had only words of praise for American civilians assigned to these areas.

"Most of these men, many of whom are young and junior in grade, are living under extremely hazardous conditions," Haugerud said. "I do not believe they are getting the public recognition that they merit."

The men to whom he was referring are employees of both the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Foreign Service. Personnel in provinces visited by Haugerud were essentially AID representatives—some of them retired military officers now in the civilian employ of the U.S. Government. Along with the AID personnel were regular Foreign Service officers who had been detailed to AID for a 2-year tour.

AID personnel generally volunteer for areas such as South Vietnam and similar remote Far East posts. Foreign Service officers go to these places by assignment.

For the most part, the American civilian personnel based in South Vietnam function in a supervisory capacity. Some oversee well-drilling operations. Others direct and assist with construction projects concerned with schools, roads, and makeshift bridges.

Or, the Federal civilians might be men who supervise distribution of fertilizer—a factor which resulted in a 50-percent increase of rice crop from 1963 to 1964 in one South Vietnamese Province.

Visiting inspecting general teams shun cities and population centers. To obtain a somewhat clearer picture and evaluation of projects and problems, inspection groups concentrate on talking to civilian personnel in the field.

As for the danger that confronts civilian personnel, the American workers in South Vietnam—it lurks everywhere—behind every turn, every shadow, every undergrowth. Sometimes it is visible, other times unseen.

"One never knows when or where the Vietcong will show up," Haugerud said. "Our people are constantly subject to kidnaping, injury or death."

Infiltrators come in many forms. They might be terrorists, snipers, or members of regular military units. They might even be maids employed in or near installations, billets or hotels occupied by Americans. But these are no ordinary maids. Their "cleaning equipment" generally consists of plastic bombs.

Despite such hazards, American civilian personnel perform their chores unarmed and without military escort. There is no other alternative. Should they be captured while carrying weapons, their punishment at the hands of the Vietcong would be much more severe than if they were unarmed.

Generally, the Vietcong hesitates to lash out against American civilian workers, but

only because this may not be to his political advantage.

Helicopter flights pose yet another source of danger. American civilian personnel often find that the helicopter provides their sole means of transportation, particularly in remote areas where roads are not easily passable. Helicopters, however, are a favorite target of Vietcong artillery or small-arms fire.

Whatever the case, neither danger, harassment nor torrential downpours put a damper on either the morale or work output of the American worker in South Vietnam.

Much of the success of the various civilian duties, which Haugerud described as "vital though nonspectacular" depends on mutual respect and work cooperation between village or hamlet leaders and American personnel, particularly those assigned to posts of "Province Representative."

"Often, the American provincial representatives spend the night in the homes of local district chiefs," Haugerud said.

Summing up his overall impression of the American Federal civilian employees in South Vietnam, Haugerud said:

"These men are a dedicated bunch. Their effort is an outstanding one."

Quite a tribute—considering it came from a man assigned to an office whose task is to criticize, in addition to auditing, inspecting and evaluating all of this country's foreign aid programs.

BILL ANDRONICOS.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator does not yield for that purpose?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I shall not speak on the merits of the bill at this time. I wish to endorse the position—

Mr. EASTLAND. I yielded for a question.

Mr. THURMOND. I endorse the position of the senior Senator from Mississippi, and I wish to make a very brief statement on it.

Mr. President, I see no justification for placing an unnecessary restriction upon the Judiciary Committee in connection with its consideration of this bill. I am certain that all Senators are aware of the fact that the Senate Judiciary Committee will promptly being their hearings and be very diligent in their study of this measure. Normal legislative procedures dictate that a measure of this importance should be considered in the most objective forum available.

The time limitation which is proposed here—15 working days—is not conducive to an objective and dispassionate study

where they throw in the sponge. They will not quit. And some day, Mr. President, the people of this Nation will come to realize what they owe to the people of Mississippi, and to the people in other areas of the South who are now being called upon, or who may soon be called upon, to resist in their own communities the forces of racial hatred and violence and civil disorder which have been unleashed in the name of civil rights but which serve most effectively the purposes and the objectives of the world Communist conspiracy.

VIETNAMESE POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a few items I wish to insert in the RECORD and make brief comments thereon.

I have been speaking with considerable frequency for more than a year now on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere in the country in opposition to U.S. out-lawry in southeast Asia. I have pointed out in these speeches that, in my judgment, we are acting completely outside the framework of international law. I repeat the charges tonight.

However, my speech for today really was made for me in Walter Lippmann's column this morning. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's column be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAMESE POLICY REEXAMINED (By Walter Lippmann)

The time cannot be far off when there will have to be a serious reappraisal of our policy in Indochina. Before saying any more about this, let me say at once that this does not mean that we can or should withdraw our troops, abandon our clients in Saigon, retire from the theater and give up the effort to safeguard the independence of the Indo-Chinese states. The reappraisal of our present policy is necessary, I submit, because the policy is not working and will not work. It will have to be reappraised in order to avert disaster: the disaster of our expulsion from the area, leaving China supreme over it, and the disaster also of an escalation to a Chinese-American war.

The stated aim of our current policy is to persuade Hanoi to call off its intervention in South Vietnam and to agree to an international conference. The success of the policy depends on a highly theoretical assumption: that we can find a point where our measured blows will not be so strong that they precipitate "a wider war"—a North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam or the entrance of a Chinese army into Indochina. But while the bombing must not be so heavy as to precipitate the wider war, it must be heavy enough to compel Hanoi to give up the struggle in which it is engaged. There are no signs that we are anywhere near finding this quite imaginary point between not too much and just enough bombing. The civil war in South Vietnam is going from bad to worse despite the bombing in North Vietnam. In fact the military situation has never been so bad as it is now.

In my view, the bombing policy is not working because it is only half a policy. It is half baked. Or, to change the metaphor, it is all stick and no carrot. We are telling the North Vietnamese that they will be very badly hurt if they do not quit. And we make these bombing raids to convince them that we have bombs and know how to drop them. But we are not telling the North

Vietnamese what kind of future there would be for them and the rest of Indochina if the war ended as we think it should end.

Our present policy lacks the essential element of a true policy when armed adversaries confront each other. The missing ingredient is a sketch of the settlement which our military effort is designed to bring about.

As our objective has been stated in the glossy generalities of the President and in the deliberately obscure language of Secretary Rusk, we are offering Hanoi a choice between destruction and military withdrawal. Because the military terms we are demanding have not been defined, they amount in fact to another version of unconditional surrender. Nothing has been said publicly, and so far as I am aware, nothing has been said privately, as to how things should be, or could be, arranged if Hanoi, in fact, did quit.

It should not surprise us moreover that the policy is not working. The measured bombing, measured to be short of precipitating a wider war, does not deter or compel Hanoi. The punishment they are suffering is tolerable and can be absorbed. On the other hand, the demand that Hanoi quit supporting the Vietcong falls on deaf ears. For the Vietcong is winning the war, and the time may be not far off when a coup in Saigon will bring forth a government which will make peace with the Vietcong and with Hanoi.

As the military situation continues to deteriorate, the cry will be raised for an attack on the populated centers of North Vietnam around Hanoi and Haiphong. There we would be killing women and children, something we are at present trying, it appears more or less successfully, not to do. I do not think that we shall stoop to that. And if we did stoop, it could land us in a war not only with the 16 million Vietnamese but with 700 million Chinese.

That would be a war we would not be able to win. For despite Mr. Hanson Baldwin and Senator McGee, who have the illusion that we could dispose of the Chinese forever by meeting them once now, there is no way of fighting a preventive war with China. When we had devastated Chinese cities, there would still be many hundreds of millions of Chinese left, and they would be dedicated at taking revenge against the white devils. Mr. Baldwin and Senator McGee should remember that the First World War, which ended in the unconditional surrender of the German army and the dissolution of the German empire nevertheless led straight to the Second World War.

If we are honest and realistic, we must prepare ourselves for the contingency that the civil war will end in a Vietnamese deal with the Vietcong, and that then we shall be asked to withdraw our troops. That would be a defeat in which we would lose considerable prestige, having unwisely engaged our prestige too lavishly. But it will still be essential to our interests to be identified with the terms of an attractive settlement in Indochina.

For whatever the course of events in South Vietnam, the United States will continue to be a great power in the South Pacific, and we shall have an important part to play in any settlement. We should have identified ourselves long ago with the terms of a settlement. We should have relied not only on the Defense Department but also on a State Department capable of conceiving a constructive settlement in southeast Asia.

While it may perhaps be too late now to affect the course of the civil war in South Vietnam, we should bear in mind that in time of war an enlightened government must prepare for peace.

Mr. MORSE. In that column he said, and I think so rightly:

The time cannot be far off when there will have to be a serious reappraisal of our policy in Indochina. Before saying any more

about this, let me say at once that this does not mean that we can or should withdraw our troops, abandon our clients in Saigon, retire from the theater and give up the effort to safeguard the independence of the Indo-Chinese states. The reappraisal of our present policy is necessary, I submit, because the policy is not working and will not work. It will have to be reappraised in order to avert disaster: the disaster of our expulsion from the area leaving China supreme over it, and the disaster also of an escalation to a Chinese-American war.

In that one paragraph Mr. Lippmann summarizes a great deal of what I have had to say for more than a year in opposition to American policy in southeast Asia.

I have not advocated that we abandon operations in this area. I have advocated that we change our status from warmaking to peacekeeping. I have advocated that we change our status from unilateral military action, without a scintilla of justification under international law, to one of multilateral action, joining with other nations in keeping our obligations and theirs under existing treaties, including our treaty obligations under the United Nations.

Instead of our becoming a lawful nation under international law, we continue to be an outlaw nation. Our out-lawry now is taking on the form of killing increasing numbers of people who themselves, so far as individuals are concerned, are innocent of any knowledge of the causes of their killing.

Mr. Lippmann goes on to say:

In my view, the bombing policy is not working because it is only half a policy. It is half baked. Or, to change the metaphor, it is all stick and no carrot. We are telling the North Vietnamese that they will be very badly hurt if they do not quit. And we make these bombing raids to convince them that we have bombs and know how to drop them. But we are not telling the North Vietnamese what kind of future there would be for them and the rest of Indochina if the war ended as we think it should end.

That is completely in line with my advocacy, for more than a year, that we have a great opportunity in southeast Asia to export what I have called economic freedom, an export that would be of aid to the masses of southeast Asia.

I have urged for more than a year that we make clear to the world that we stand ready to assist the peace-loving nations of the world in setting up something comparable to what Franklin Roosevelt recommended some 20 years ago; namely, an international trusteeship in this troubled spot of the world.

That would require a negotiated settlement, not on the part of the United States, the North Vietnamese, Red China, and South Vietnam, but a negotiated settlement directed by third parties nonparticipant in the war up to this time.

We seem to think that any negotiated settlement must be one that we dictate. The United States is never going to be able to dictate a settlement in southeast Asia, this year, or 10 years from now, or half a century away.

When there is a war situation such as there is there now, the settlement is going to have to be reached by the exercise of the good offices of nonparticipants. I

think the best source for those negotiators is to be found in the United Nations, exercising the procedure made available to all countries members thereof under United Nations procedure.

This is now an American war. It is no longer a South Vietnamese war. The South Vietnamese are now doing what the United States tells them to do. The United States is directing the war. The United States is doing the bombing and the killing. The United States is using American planes completely manned by Americans. The United States is dropping the bombs. The United States is making use, in a variety of forms, of the 7th Fleet. The United States is conducting the war, and the United States is conducting the war completely outside of the Constitution of the United States. The United States is conducting this war without a declaration of war.

Although the administration likes to soft-pedal this weakness in its program, history is not going to soft-pedal it. History is going to show the shocking dereliction of the United States in respect to its conduct in southeast Asia.

We do not help ourselves by pointing out that the Communists are just as bad. They are. They too have been violating their international obligations. There is no question about the North Vietnamese violations or Red China's violations, and possibly that of others. The fact is that we are going to have to face up to the warnings of Walter Lippmann, because history will prove him right.

Let me read another warning or two from this great article:

As our objective has been stated in the glossy generalities of the President and in the deliberately obscure language of Secretary Rusk, we are offering Hanoi a choice between destruction and military withdrawal. Because the military terms we are demanding have not been defined, they amount in fact to another version of unconditional surrender. Nothing has been said publicly, and so far as I am aware nothing has been said privately, as to how things should be or could be arranged if Hanoi in fact did quit.

It should not surprise us moreover that the policy is not working. The measured bombing, measured to be short of precipitating a wider war, does not deter or compel Hanoi. The punishment they are suffering is tolerable and can be absorbed. On the other hand, the demand that Hanoi quit supporting the Vietcong falls on deaf ears. For the Vietcong is winning the war, and the time may be not far off when a coup in Saigon will bring forth a government which will make peace with the Vietcong and with Hanoi.

The Lippmann article should be read by the Senate and the people of the United States. I say to the Johnson administration: "Answer it. The country is entitled to a documented answer."

It will not answer it because it cannot. The premises laid down in that article are unanswerable if the attempt to answer it is made on the basis of a justification of American outlawry in southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in today's Washington Daily News entitled, "This Dirty Little (Viet) War—Bombings Cloud Fact That Ground War Goes Badly."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS DIRTY LITTLE (VIET) WAR—BOMBINGS CLOUD FACT THAT GROUND WAR GOES BADLY
(By R. H. Shackford, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

SAIGON, March 18.—The aerial bombings of North Vietnam are spectacular, and for more than a month they have received great publicity and official attention.

But they tend to hide—and offer a chance for people to forget—the dismal fact that the war on the ground is going very badly for our side, as it has been for many months.

This is especially true of north central and northern sections of the country where, as in the case of Binh Dinh province, battalion-sized battles have been going on for weeks without decisive results.

MAGNITUDE

Last week's casualty figures made public today suggest the magnitude of this dirty little war. The South Vietnamese Army suffered 250 killed and the Vietcong 520. The bitter fact is that all those killed on both sides are Vietnamese. In the same period two American military deaths occurred.

Another clue as to how far from its end this war is—however many air strikes of the present type occur—is that 175,000 refugees fled from battle areas of north-central provinces where conventional warfare is going on.

Some officials foresee the possibility of a million or so such refugees eventually adding to the problems of the South Vietnamese Government.

CAUTIONING

Still other officials here are cautioning against encouraging any tendency to think the U.S. decision to bomb the north will solve this problem. They doubt that selective limited bombing will change matters at all, unless there is a vast change in offensive actions on the ground.

American bombings certainly have improved for the moment the morale of the South Vietnamese army and of the men who try to run the government. But the average Vietnamese is not very excited—arguing that it is Vietnamese who are being killed by United States and South Vietnamese planes, whether above or below the 17th parallel.

PRELUDE

Unless the bombings of the north are a prelude to a big war, which no one, including the Americans, wants, they have very limited potential in forcing the North Vietnamese Communist leader Ho Chi Minh to plead for a cease-fire. Only the most naive believe Ho Chi Minh will do that while the Vietcong position on the ground is so superior.

In the wake of excitement, publicity, propaganda, and hopes resulting from the air strikes, there is a dangerous tendency to forget what the highest U.S. officials have preached for months—that the war in Vietnam would have to be won in the south, and that any action against the north is merely supplementary.

The best summary of this policy, which still prevails despite hopefulness in the air strikes, was made by the State Department last year when it outlined the four options before President Johnson.

REJECTED

It rejected categorically the first two: withdrawal from Vietnam and "neutralization," which it considered a euphemism for communication. The third option was described as "military actions outside South Vietnam, particularly against North Vietnam to supplement the counterinsurgency program in South Vietnam."

Before such action finally was taken, in early February, the policy statement said:

"Whatever ultimate course of action may be forced upon us by the other side, it is

clear that actions outside South Vietnam would be only a supplement to, not a substitute for, progress within South Vietnam's own borders."

The fourth option was to help the South Vietnamese "win the battle in their own country."

On each of his visits to Washington, Ambassador Maxwell Taylor argued that the war here would be won or lost in the south. Despite bombings of the north, that fact never has been truer.

If the American bombings of the north provoke the South Vietnamese to take aggressive action against the Vietcong, then the tide might turn. But if, as some fear, America's more direct involvement leads South Vietnam to "leave it to Uncle Sam," then only disaster is ahead for both the United States and this country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the escalation of the war by the bombing of North Vietnam distracts attention from the fact that we are making little progress against the Vietcong. We are not going to make any progress against the Vietcong. We can kill a great many of them, but we are dealing with the crystallization of the determination to put the United States out of Asia. The United States will be kicked out of Asia 10, 15, 20, 50 years from now, but during that entire period of time, the struggle against the United States will continue. Sooner or later, the American people—after hundreds of thousands of coffins containing dead American soldiers are shipped back to the United States—will finally hold to an accounting any administration which seeks to continue the unnecessary killing in Asia not only of American boys but also of other human beings.

At long last, the situation will be settled, but it will be settled on the basis of terms which intelligence could settle upon now, if intelligence were to be applied to the war in South Vietnam, and if the administration were to insist that the Pentagon—which obviously is determined to head us into a massive war in Asia—be placed under a check.

Read the testimony and the public statements of men in uniform representing the United States today. Some of those leaders, testifying on the House side, have become the most desperate men in the world. It will be said that they are retired. Nevertheless, they represent the war psychology of the Pentagon, and have for years, in the testimony as to the need for a preventive war against China.

There can be no successful preventive war against China. A preventive war against China would mean a massive war. It would mean throwing the world into a holocaust.

Moving 300,000 American troops into southeast Asia if Red China makes a move is being discussed. Those 300,000 troops would soon be increased to 3 million, and we cannot produce a single military expert who will deny it, if we get into a war with China.

The military consultant of the New York Times spoke the other night on the television as to the need for sending over 1 million troops. That is only the beginning, but at least the military consultant of the New York Times was smoked out, at long last, for he has openly advocated what has been perfectly

honor to act as host for many Americans who could in good faith undertake to visit Alabama. There they will find persons who also feel concern, people who think, act, and behave very much like the concerned, honest, and responsible folks of Omaha, Nebr., Scranton, Pa., and thousands of other American communities.

What, then, was the problem? The problem is the heat of emotion brought upon us by the two extremes—those who believe that any action can be excused in the advancement of an objective or in the prevention of it.

We ask for your understanding, my colleagues; we ask you to read the fine print as well as the headlines. We ask you to consider the action of wave upon wave of demonstrators in the light of advances made in our State; we ask you to consider who the people are who have used moderation in their approach to the problems confronting this Nation of ours today. For the courts had ruled in favor of the demands of the Negroes, registration was proceeding, there was good communication between the races. But still the hordes of demonstrators came.

How long must a people bear the continued abuse and insults? Having made their point they were unwilling to withdraw. They have found a good horse and they are riding it to death, no matter what the consequences.

Judge Learned Hand wrote:

What is the spirit of moderation? It is the temper which does not press a partisan advantage to its bitter end, which can understand and will respect the other side, which feels a unity between all citizens—real and not the fictitious product of propaganda, which recognizes their common fate and their common aspirations—in a word, which has faith in the sacredness of the individual.

Having stated what I, as an Alabamian, want to say to the Nation today, let us turn now to the question of how we might best proceed from here so as to assure more American citizens of the right to vote.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law on July 2, 1964, just a little over 9 months ago. As we all know, the debate over the legislation raged across the Nation for many months. In every congressional district of the land, there were protagonists and antagonists. Some, in their strong feeling, said that this legislation would solve our problems, that it would bring the matter off the streets and into the courts. Others, including many in the South, felt that many sections of the bill may have been unconstitutional.

But, in any case, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 became law, and though many in the South found serious fault with it, efforts began in good faith to comply with its provisions.

Specifically with regard to voting rights, a Federal judge in Mobile, Ala., on February 4 of this year ordered under the new law that all persons in Dallas County in which Selma is located, who could read and write should be given the opportunity to register and to vote by the next election. The court order also stipulated that if all who wished to register by July 1965, were not registered, the court would proceed to do it.

Furthermore, the people of Dallas County were prepared to proceed with compliance, and in fact, went to some pains to call attention to their situation as a demonstration of good faith, and as an effort at the kind of communication which might have averted subsequent problems.

But for purposes which I will leave for others to determine, groups outside Alabama proceeded with 6 weeks of irresponsible and well publicized demonstrations which have resulted in tragedy, death, and greater frictions than existed before.

The emotional strength of these events has been so considerable, that the President of the United States, who we are told ordinarily seeks to "reason together" with people in search of a consensus, told the Nation on Monday night this week that there must be "no compromise." Forsaking the spirit of moderation of which Judge Hand so effectively wrote, the President has evidently joined those who feel that extremism in this case is a virtue.

Mr. Johnson has proposed new legislation to set up Federal registrars for voting in all elections.

The question all Americans, not just those of us from Southern States, should ask themselves, is twofold: first, is it now time to strike off again in this direction; and second, if so, how far do we go? How far can we go in centralization of Government authority under conditions of emotionalism? And how much unemotional restraint might be wise?

Let me express my feeling that at this point, 9 months after enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and 6 weeks after an Alabama judge has issued orders which would redress the grievances of Dallas County Negroes, it is far too early to act, based on emotionalism arising out of those grievances, in a way which might be considered unwise in the after-light of calm consideration.

We respect the law. In fact, I cannot put it too strongly, that I believe the whole key to the civil rights situation is respect for the law. Street demonstrations have, as their underlying element, an unhealthy disrespect for law. Surely to rush into the enactment of new law, under the pressure of emotion surrounding the disrespect for existing law, cannot bring about a real solution.

The heart of the President's proposal on voting rights is enforcement by direct Federal action, a more rigid Federal enforcement than exists under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Since Alabama is already in the midst of compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in a way which would seem to assure full voting rights, American citizens should ask themselves if the price for the new law might be too high.

If, as the President says, we should act in this matter with no hesitation and no compromise, then we should at least consider that we may be paying a price approximately equivalent to our Federal system of Government for a new law which may be unnecessary.

If it is thought to be necessary to give this kind of enforcement power to the National Government, enforcement

which would involve local elections, then what stands in the way of similar National Government enforcement of any other aspect of our lives whether it be the operation of our schools, the maintenance of local streets, or the choice of books for our libraries?

Apparently, my view represents a minority so far as the Nation is concerned. A voting law will surely be approved with an overwhelming majority. And as before, Alabama and the South will make every effort to comply.

But I want to express my feeling that our country may be in trouble. If there is any lesson of history worth giving our attention, it is that when any nation stands up to applaud, again and again, the giving over of greater and greater centralized authority to its national government, and when with every passing month the people of a free nation seem more and more eager to take responsibility out of their own hands and give it over to the federal government, paying less and less heed to words of caution and restraint from a shrinking minority, then that free nation has trouble lurking on the horizon.

Thoughtful people might say, "Well, State and local responsibility must be superseded when it fails to meet its reasonable obligations, if justice is to be done."

Let me contend that there is another alternative. And that is to work ever more to develop and foster local responsibility; to recognize the need for leadership, and to build it—in this case, to stimulate the spirit of moderation instead of to stifle it; to recognize progress where it exists, and encourage it rather than penalize it as we are about to do.

The headlong rush to establish Federal enforcers is an irreversible act. This authority, once established, will not be revoked. It can only be expanded.

The trend, however, appears inevitable, and is due in large part to an emotional public misreading of the signs and to a departure from Abraham Lincoln's wise caution to which we gave great honor at the Capitol Building only a few short days ago: "Let us judge not that we be not judged."

VN Viet Rhymes With Nyet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, firm support across the country has developed behind President Johnson's conduct of the Vietnamese situation. I have been especially pleased to note that the outstanding publications of the country have recognized that the President must take a firm stand in Vietnam. It has been also interesting to note that local community newspapers who as a rule do not editorialize on international affairs recognize the tremendous importance on the stand now being taken in Vietnam. One such publication is the Park

March 18, 1965

A1286

Forest Reporter, Park Forest, Ill., whose editorial of Wednesday, March 3, I insert in the RECORD as evidence of nationwide support for a strong Vietnam policy.

VIET RHYMES WITH NYET

The firmness with which President Johnson conducts the Vietnamese and southeast Asia problem is worthy of more than casual mention. Although the instinct to negotiate is strong, it is more important, particularly for a lasting peace, not to abdicate our role of protector. A firm nyet has met all offers to negotiate.

The United States was called in by a nation forced to defend itself from a foreign foe. This was not a civil war. The South Vietnamese have had no designs on the territory of their northern neighbor. They wish to be freed of the menace guerrilla tactics have inflicted on them. We are not trying to assess their valor or lack of it. Suffice it to say, despite serious political considerations which hamper normal military operations, representatives of the Saigon government under arms have given a good accounting of themselves in a very frustrating situation where it is difficult on sight at least, to distinguish friend from foe.

Our Government's refusal to join a negotiating seance is well taken. One doesn't need a long memory to recall that a treaty at Geneva, which sought to remedy the Laotian problem, did exactly the opposite. Communists, particularly the ruthless Red Chinese variety, do not know or practice the tenets of honor. Even the Soviets, who show halfhearted signs of supporting the Chinese in southeast Asia, recognize that their oriental comrades cannot be trusted, therefore, despite a change in the ruling Russian hierarchy, the schism between the two nations remains ruptured.

Although Moscow utters shallow defiance at the white paper our Government recently released as incontrovertible evidence of Red Chinese aims, we agree with the State and Defense Departments' evaluation that the red bear isn't spoiling for a fight * * * to protect Red China's hand. If there's any merit to the presence of prestige, our international stock has zoomed, despite De Gaulle's mutterings or Britain's eagerness to pave the way to the conference table.

A show of strength is the only way to deal with a Communist power. This is one of the few times when the sword is mightier than the word.

The Sabine River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we in east Texas are very interested in the total and complete development of the Sabine River so that it may benefit to the fullest our great area of east Texas. I include articles that appeared in the Longview Daily News March 10, 1965, and March 11, 1965.

I commend all who have shown interest in the development of this great river and trust that rapid progress will be made in its development:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 10, 1965]

LONGVIEW CANAL

(NOTE.—The following editorial, under the above heading, is reproduced from the great Dallas Morning News of Wednesday.)

Unanimous action by the house at Austin in approving the bill to create the Sabine River Navigation District speaks well for the prospect of barge navigation between Longview and the gulf.

This is a wise addition of water transportation to other purposes embodied in the vast improvement program now underway on this major Texas river at a total cost in excess of \$100 million.

The Sabine River Authority's Lake Tawakoni on the upper reaches of the stream near Greenville, built at a cost of \$25 million, is now the largest single source of water supply for Dallas. It is also one of the finest recreation centers in Texas.

The largest single item in the Sabine program is construction of the Toledo Bend Dam and Reservoir now in progress near Newton at a cost of \$60 million. The States of Texas and Louisiana are sharing \$30 million of this cost by cash advances to the project. Private power companies of the two States separated by the river are underwriting another \$30 million in revenue bonds by contracts to buy \$2 million a year from the hydroelectric generating plant at Toledo Bend.

The barge canal to Longview calls for the building of three locks on the stream above Toledo Bend Reservoir at an outlay of only \$15 million, which the new navigation district would be empowered to finance by revenue bonds based on toll charges. It would be a splendid rounding out of the multiple-purpose nature of the Sabine River program and would afford immense economic benefits to all of east Texas and western Louisiana. Business and civic spokesmen for Longview and other affected areas are to be congratulated upon their vision for low-cost water transportation.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 10, 1965]

BILL NOW READY FOR SIGNATURE OF GOVERNOR
(By Dick Sands)

The Middle Sabine Navigation District bill which envisions eventual waterborne traffic between Longview and the gulf coast moved a step nearer reality Wednesday when the Texas Senate passed the measure without opposition.

Senator Jack Strong of Longview, notified the News and Journal of the bill's passage shortly after noon.

All that is required now is the Governor's signature for the bill to become law. Gov. John Connally is in Washington testifying on oil imports and it will be early next week before he sees the bill. He studied the proposal before it ever was introduced.

The bill, received from the house Tuesday at 10:30 a.m., had cleared the senate water committee in special session and, with rules suspended, drew a 29 to 0 vote in the senate at 11:50 a.m. Wednesday.

It took the bill just 25 hours, 20 minutes to go through the senate, a record.

The Sabine navigation bill envisions construction of three locks on the river between Longview and Toledo Bend Lake headwaters at Logansport, La. Construction would be financed by \$15 million in revenue bonds, to be repaid from toll charges from barge traffic.

The locks would permit barges to travel 75 miles upstream beyond the Toledo Bend 65-mile-long reservoir now under construction by Sabine River authorities of Texas and Louisiana. With locks at Toledo Bend Dam, waterborne traffic could travel 200 miles direct between Longview and the Gulf of Mexico.

The bill was passed by a 142-to-0 unanimous vote of the house Monday. After obtaining permission to bring the measure up under a calendar permitting suspension of rules requiring it be read on 3 separate days

"This is a fabulous bill. It involves no

local tax money, no State tax money, no Federal money." His fellow legislators applauded the statement.

Legislators from the four counties directly affected by the bill were agreeable to it, Representative Allen reported. Even the railroad lobbyists, who traditionally oppose legislation to promote traffic on water, highway or air, did not actively oppose the bill.

One railroad spokesman said they took that stand because the plan did not involve taxing them to benefit a competitor.

The bill authorizes creation of the Middle Sabine River Navigation District, for conservation and reclamation purposes, and with authority "to promote, construct, maintain and operate * * * navigable canals or waterways and all navigational systems of facilities auxiliary thereto * * *."

The district also is empowered to acquire ports, levees, wharves, docks, locks, warehouses, grain elevators, belt railways and other aids consistent to the operation of ports or waterways within its area.

It also is authorized to issue revenue bonds and to be governed by a board of eight directors, two from each county in the district. They shall serve without pay during 2-year terms of office, and actual expenses incurred by a director in the discharge of his official duties may be reimbursed, but only from funds raised in the county from which he is a member.

The district officials are directed to work in coordination with the Sabine River Authority of Texas, which is developing the entire river basin and is currently building the \$60 million Toledo Bend Dam and Reservoir jointly with the Sabine River Authority, State of Louisiana, under a two-State compact and without Federal funds.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Mar. 11, 1965]

SABINE PROGRESS

Under the inspired and masterful leadership of Representative John Allen of Gregg County and Senator Jack Strong of this district, the Middle Sabine Navigation District bill has sailed through the legislature with unanimous votes of approval and is headed for the Governor's desk for his signature.

We of the Longview News and Journal extend public commendation on behalf of the people of east Texas to Representative Allen and Senator Strong for the statesmanship they have demonstrated in getting this important legislation approved in record time.

Legislators Strong and Allen were joined by others from the east Texas area in helping push the bill through. Included were Representative John Mobley, of Kilgore, of the Gregg-Smith Floterial district; Representative Nelson Cowles, of Harrison County; Representative Steve Burgess, of Nacogdoches County; Representative Guy McDonald, of Panola and Rusk Counties; Representative J. E. Miller, Jr., of Newton County, and others.

For the general information of all those east Texas people who are interested in the matter, we believe it would be helpful to present this project in proper perspective as it relates to the longtime plan for development of the Sabine River and its watershed for all the people of Texas and Louisiana.

Some have asked if this navigation project was not a brand new idea. The excellent work of the two fine young legislators from Longview who carried the bill through the house and senate certainly turned the spotlight of public attention to this area. This project, however, is one of a series of major steps in the overall master plan for Sabine development.

The publisher of the Longview News and Journal, his newspapers and staff, have been working closely with the development of the Sabine for more than a decade and a half. This first came to public attention when in the house, Representative Allen told his colleagues:

involuntary redistributions of the nation's wealth from more productive individuals to less productive persons.

7. More concrete than principle, past experience in other countries should also be our guide. France's medicare system is bankrupt. Britain's costs have soared, services have been cut, doctors have left the country and those remaining have threatened to strike. In Canada, costs have far exceeded estimates and income, and doctors actually did go on strike. Yet, in the face of these failures, the voters in each country demand more and more services.

8. U.S. Government officials admit that even our present social security system is not self-supporting but utilizes funds from general taxes also.

9. Fraud has plagued foreign medicare plans. Also the strain on medical personnel and facilities has vastly increased, with some cases of persons even seeking unneeded medical care.

10. Doctors are burdened with paperwork, requiring as much as 4 hours a day in some countries.

11. The proposed King-Anderson bill is just a foot in the door for the entrance of complete socialized medicine, one proponent of the measure admitted.

12. Private insurance companies and programs will be hurt by the Government operated service. In the past we have seen the inefficiency of Government when it enters business. The Government will become the impersonal third party looming between the doctor and his patient.

13. The need for compulsory Government insurance programs is actually decreasing since the proportion of people covered by private, cooperative, and local public programs is increasing yearly.

As with any problem, it is best to apply corrective measures to the source, not the symptoms of the dilemma. Therefore, several remedies suggest themselves.

The first and most important goal should be to cut the high costs of medical care. The way to do this is to eliminate or limit the causes of the soaring expenses. Two such causes are inflation and the population explosion. Solutions to these problems are too complex for this discussion.

Yet some immediate steps can be taken to halt the price spiral in the medical care field. Instead of pouring money into medicare programs, the Government should do more to encourage the training of more doctors and nurses and the construction of additional medical facilities. Admittedly, this is Government intervention, but it is more limited and much less costly than medicare.

Hospital management should be improved. Automation should be employed in hospitals and nursing homes wherever practical. Doctors should encourage home care for patients with completely incurable diseases.

Of course, there will always be a few people who can't afford their medical bills no matter how small. For these there is local charity.

It will cost less in the long run to be more practical to end the need for a Federal medicare program. This is better than installing a compulsory, mushrooming medicare plan which, like cancer, just grows and grows until it kills the very person that gives it sustenance.

Restricted News in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks I have been disturbed over reports which have been filtering through from newsmen who are covering the war in Vietnam, over alleged restrictions on news coverage in that area. Evidently there have been some instances where the press has been barred, and while I do not question the necessity for certain security requirements, I am concerned about the possibility that the American public might not be getting a true and clear picture of what is happening in southeast Asia.

I have today written to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, and am setting forth herewith the text of that letter, for the benefit of my colleagues:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 18, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to express my deepest concern over recent reports of official restrictions on news coverage in Vietnam. Responsible journalists seem increasingly disturbed by the number of incidents where newsmen are being barred from covering many important aspects of our action in southeast Asia. Many members of the press have suggested that present official policy represents a departure from traditional conventions of war coverage. Apparently the problem is sufficiently serious to prompt public statements such as that made by Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press, which appeared in the New York Times of March 18, 1965:

"News restrictions imposed by the Pentagon raise serious questions as to whether the American people will be able to get a true picture of the war in Vietnam."

My own concern over this matter is increased by persisting speculation by such international leaders as the Secretary General of the United Nations, suggesting that the American people are not "learning all the facts about Vietnam." I am sure you agree that we cannot afford to give any such speculations credibility.

I am certain you feel strongly, as do I, that a fundamental democratic right is the right to know. On many occasions you have expressed your commitment to this right, despite the security requirements implicit in the conduct of modern foreign policy. Let me say that I appreciate the constant difficulty of determining exactly where security requirements necessitate some formal censorship. I am sure this matter is given continuing attention by you and other Government officials.

However, I do feel that this country cannot profit by ambiguities in official policy toward newspaper coverage in southeast Asia. If, as the reports of prudent and responsible newspapermen suggest, such ambiguities do exist, I would welcome any explanation of their cause and character.

Thank you for your consideration, and with my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
Member of Congress.

Official Opening of the Washington Hilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 10, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, since the city of Washington was founded a century and a half ago it has been the host to the Nation. Since America obtained the pinnacle of world leadership Washington has received guests from all parts of the world. It is not unusual that the hotels and restaurants of the National Capital have been more significant than those of any other American city.

It was my pleasure to be present today at the official opening of the Washington Hilton, a great new hotel to accommodate visitors in the Federal City. I was glad to join the distinguished Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, many of our colleagues in the Congress, and Government and community leaders in hailing the completion and dedication of a great new facility.

Very properly the host on this occasion was Mr. Conrad N. Hilton, chairman of the Hilton Hotels Corp. Mr. Hilton's remarks describe a significant event and it is my pleasure to insert them in the RECORD at this point:

"THE UNOFFICIAL PALACE"—REMARKS BY CONRAD N. HILTON, CHAIRMAN, HILTON HOTELS CORP., CHAIRMAN AND PRESIDENT, HILTON INTERNATIONAL CO., AT THE DEDICATION LUNCHEON, THE WASHINGTON HILTON, WASHINGTON, D.C., THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1965

For a great many years we have had the honor and pleasure of opening hotels across the continent, from Texas to Montreal, from New York to Los Angeles, from Portland to New Orleans. In each I made some brief dedicatory remarks. In New York I discussed its challenging millions; in San Francisco its lovely hills and the promise of the Orient; in Denver the Rockies; in Pittsburgh the Golden Triangle. But what is to be said of Washington, a city possessing within itself such sophistication and at the same time such innocence? The city's only purpose—

as is the purpose of all government—is to make people happy. The lives of your more than a million population revolve around Metropolitan Washington's two major industries—government and politics—the pursuit of happiness. Or is that one industry?

Four years ago Percy and Harold Uris, and we of the Hilton Corp., set out to build a hotel that would serve as an "unofficial palace" for our Nation's Capital, much as the Waldorf-Astoria has been for New York City over the years. To do that we had first to study and capture the mood of the city. We found very early that that mood is a unique and evanescent one. We knew that to capture the Washington spirit we had to build a hotel that was at once proudly American, yet distinctively cosmopolitan, befitting a city that is both a world capital and the Capital of the United States of America. It had to be big enough for the statesmen of the world, yet small enough, comfortable enough, for the simplest citizen who comes to see his Government in action.

The frame, the setting of the hotel, had been designed in splendor 170 years before by the great French engineer, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, master planner for one of the most beautiful cities of the world. And if Bill Tabler, our architect here today, thinks that he sometimes has trouble with owners, corporation officers, and city officials around the country, let him count his blessings. Imagine having for your bosses, as did L'Enfant, George Washington, James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and Dolly Madison.

Three years ago it was Bill Tabler's task to catch and cage this spirit of the city of Washington in concrete and glass. The result, as you see today, is a unique "bull wing" design that is both fluid and elegant. The Washington Hilton, we believe, is an eminent interpretation of the mood and spirit of a great city, a great nation. Here is a hotel that will complement and accent that mood.

All of us who have shared in the Washington Hilton's conception and construction—the Uris Buildings Corp. who built the hotel and the Hilton Hotels Corp. who will operate it, are proud of this new "unofficial palace" for official Washington. Seeing the hotel and utilizing its many attractive features is much more exciting than hearing about it. We do hope that you will all take the opportunity after lunch to inspect at your leisure the elegant, elliptical lobbies and public rooms, the spacious grounds and sports facilities.

There are several unique and imaginative features of the hotel which are not immediately apparent, and of which we are particularly proud. A special entrance, to accommodate heads of state and important visitors, has been designed which will allow convenient access by private elevator to a splendid private reception room adjacent to the International Ballroom where we are today. This great ballroom, in which you are the first to lunch, is the hotel's tour-de-force of interior design. Besides today's luncheon, state banquets, inaugural balls, formal dinners, and debutante cotillions will all find their place in this red-and-white elegance that will accommodate, without—as you see—a single interior supporting column, more than 4,200 persons.

In the gardens are a modern tennis club, complete with full locker facilities, cocktail lounge and dining room, and a large swimming pool. Elegant dining has always been an integral part of Hilton hotels. With a special emphasis on soft lighting, food of traditional excellence, and a cellar well stocked with vintage wines, the restaurants of your new hotel will emulate this proud tradition.

Because I have had very little to do with it, I may brag that the architecture of your new hotel will contribute to the city's beauty. You who have watched it in construction,

know better than I that it has a dozen significant and far-reaching architectural innovations. Its interiors are authentic reproductions of period or contemporary art, decor, and furnishings. The most modern and efficient equipment and facilities dramatically exemplify American life and its achievements, and a warm culture borrowed from across the world.

As the "unofficial palace" for the Nation's Capital, your new hotel will typify and carry within itself a cross section of everything that goes on in Washington. Men and women of a hundred nations, of all races and creeds, guests and staff, will participate in a thousand activities of international and national, social, economic and political, religious and artistic significance. As residents of Washington and its metropolitan area, you indeed have something to be proud of.

A hotel in Washington, D.C., today holds such a position in the community and in the Nation that it must be manned, managed, and staffed by men and women of greater vision, broader cultural horizons, and deeper instincts of leadership than any hotelmen in the world, than any in history. I assure you that our managers and staff here in your new hotel have that vision, that culture, that sense of leadership.

I feel that you have already been sufficiently generous with your time and with your kind attention. It has been an honor to speak with you this afternoon. It is with a feeling of gratitude that Percy and Harold Uris and we of the Hilton Corp. have come to dedicate your new hotel. I know that all of you join us in the fervent wish that this hotel will fulfill the expectations of its founders.

I wish to extend the personal thanks of Mr. Williford, our new president, and myself, as chairman of Hilton Hotels Corp., and of all the Hilton family around the world, to the Uris brothers for their fine cooperation and teamwork. Gratitude also to all who helped to make this project possible, the architects who used their knowledge to convert the dreams of art and architecture into this structure; to the workmen, skilled and unskilled, who with hearts and able hands translated the sketches of the designers, the mathematics of the engineers into a building of beauty. To all of them, for generations to come, this hotel will be a monument to their energy and enterprise. I would be remiss at this time if I failed to refer to the splendid cooperation extended by public officials during the past 3 years of planning and construction. Without their help this hotel would never have been built.

On a March day in 1791—a day much like this—the great Frenchman who laid out your city, stopped his horse on the muddy bank of the Potomac and looked across the wilderness and tall grasses to the rolling hills beyond. Which would be Capitol Hill? Which be crowned by the home of the Presidents? His eye must have caught the splendid site where our hotel now stands—and passed on. For that we are grateful.

Today we give to L'Enfant, to you, and to the Nation, Washington's unofficial palace.

Opposition to Closing of Veterans' Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 18, 1965

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked to learn of the proposed

closing of so many of the veterans' facilities. While none in my State of Maryland are included in the list, they will feel the effect of the closing of facilities in nearby States. Therefore, I registered my protests with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the following statement, which I repeat for the Record.

With respect to the projected closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, homes, and regional offices, I wonder if the Veterans' Administrator has thought this proposal through from the viewpoint of human relations.

Economy in the operation of any Government activity is desirable, of course, possibly more important today than ever before. As a country, we are living far beyond our means. The only way to correct such a dangerous situation is to cut back Government spending wherever such cuts are reasonably possible. But it is important that these cuts be reasonably possible. Just because we are not engaged at the moment in a major war should not make us forgetful of what the veterans suffered and many are still suffering, to save this country and the world from chaos. Perhaps the proposed closing would save the few millions claimed, perhaps not. There is not a shadow of a doubt, that the effects of such closings would be reduced medical services and great inconvenience to thousands of veterans whose need for these services stems directly or indirectly from war-incurred ills or injuries.

From experience in my own State, I know that there is always a long waiting period for beds in the veterans hospitals. The closing of facilities in nearby States would undoubtedly mean that many veterans normally using them, would be sent to Maryland hospitals, causing even greater problems than now exist.

We have lavished billions of dollars on peoples everywhere whose only claim on our generosity was their need. Do not let us, as a nation, turn our backs on these veterans who served us so well when we needed them so desperately.

Minnesota State Senate Resolution on Civil Rights in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the State Senate of Minnesota passed an important resolution on March 10 calling for protection of citizens in securing the rights of Americans to their basic freedoms in Alabama.

This measure of the concern of people throughout the Nation about recent acts of violence deserves the attention of all the Congress.